SOCIAL SCIENCES

LIBRARY
SEP 16 1957
DETROIT

NATIONAL REVIEW

20 Cents

September 21, 1957

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

War in Little Rock

Governor Faubus Clouds the Issue

L. BRENT BOZELL

The Court Views Its Handiwork

AN EDITORIAL

Why Johnny Shouldn't Read

ALLAN HOUSE RYSKIND

Articles and Reviews by ·····JAMES JACKSON KILPATRICK
MAX EASTMAN·ANTHONY LEJEUNE·ROBERT PHELPS
SAM M. JONES·RODNEY GILBERT·JAMES BURNHAM

For the Record

The California State Federation of Labor with 1,200,000 members has written all its affiliates charging that Senator Knowland's stand in favor of right-to-work legislation "has made labor the dominant issue in a California Governorship fight." In 1954, before the Federation supported Governor Goodwin Knight, he promised to veto all right-to-work legislation.

In its first session, the 85th Congress decreed appropriations at a rate of $700,000 a minute....During the last fiscal year, the federal government's civilian payroll went above $11 billion for the first time in history. Though the military services dropped 1,278 civilian employees in July, other government agencies hired an additional 7,552....Senate investigators disclose that only their intervention kept the Air Force from selling $245,000 worth of tires in England as surplus property. The tires have been requested by other government agencies....$8.5 million has been earmarked to air-condition the main building of the Department of Agriculture. When built in 1937 it cost $10 million.

The London Daily Telegraph deplores the attempt of the federal government to impose school integration because it is worsening race relations. "The lot of the Negro in the South," it says, "was improving steadily, and even rapidly, before the Supreme Court made its dramatic intervention."

A curious phenomenon existed in the West German campaign: both Dr. Adenauer and his major rival Mr. Ollenhauer stressed their friendship for the United States....Emphasizing the importance of convincing the Algerian nationalists that their cause is hopeless, a French official charged that "Senator Kennedy's speech favoring Algerian independence was worth 10,000 rifles to the rebels."...The livelihood of at least 250,000 Japanese will be affected when the 30,000 American military men pull out of Japan. It is estimated that Japan will lose $1 billion when they leave.

Larry Moyer, one of the five American students allowed to interview John T. Downey — imprisoned by the Communist Chinese since 1952 for "spying" — dissents from his colleagues' report that Downey appeared in good health. Moyer insists that Downey's hands and feet trembled, that it was almost impossible to get him to speak.

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR: Wm. F. Buckley, Jr.

PUBLISHER: William A. Rusher

EDITORS

L. Brent Bozell — James Burnham
John Chamberlain — Whittaker Chambers
Willmoore Kendall — Suzanne La Follette
Frank S. Meyer

PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

ASSOCIATES

Maureen L. Buckley — Priscilla L. Buckley
Jonathan Mitchell — Morrie Ryskind

CONTRIBUTORS

C. D. Batchelor, John C. Caldwell, Frank Chodorov, John Abbot Clark, Forrest Davis, A. Derso, Max Eastman, Medford Evans, Karl Hess, John D. Kreuttner, J. B. Matthews, Gerhart Niemeyer, Revilo Oliver, E. Merrill Root, Freda Utley, Richard M. Weaver, Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, Garry Wills

FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS

London: Anthony Lejeune
Geneva: Wilhelm Roepke — *Madrid*: J. Dervin
Munich: E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn

ASSISTANT TO THE PUBLISHER: J. P. McFadden

CONTENTS SEPTEMBER 21, 1957 VOL. IV, NO. 11

THE WEEK 243

ARTICLES

The Octopus—1957 .....Sam M. Jones 249
Why Johnny Shouldn't Read
Allan House Ryskind 253
John Reed "Rehabilitated" .....Max Eastman 257

DEPARTMENTS

For the Record 242
National Trends .....L. Brent Bozell 248
The Third World War .....James Burnham 251
Letter from London .....Anthony Lejeune 252
Letter from the Continent
E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn 256
Arts and Manners .....Garry Wills 258
To the Editor 262

BOOKS IN REVIEW

The South's "Granitic Opposition"
James Jackson Kilpatrick 259
The Not-So-Different Kremlin
Rodney Gilbert 260
Fiction Chronicle .....Robert Phelps 261

VERSE

The Final View of Henry Two ....Johannes Eff 250

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly, except the second and third weeks in August, by National Weekly, Inc. Copyrighted 1957 in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc. Second-class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.

EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:
211 East 37th St.
New York 16, N. Y.
Telephone: MUrray Hill 2-0941

RATES, Twenty cents a copy, $7.00 a year, $13.00 for two years. Foreign. $9.00 a year; Canada, $8.00 a year.

The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

The WEEK

● Vice President Richard M. Nixon came up to New York City last week to warn a convocation of the nation's mayors that they could not count upon the federal government to give them additional help in financing municipal projects. He brought no reassurance, however, that the people would be allowed to keep enough of their incomes to take care of their own local needs.

● The *New York Times'* Harrison Salisbury, who has always astounded us by his ability to proceed from unassailable facts to a cockeyed conclusion, has outdone himself in a recent report from Tirana, the capital of Albania. As Mr. Salisbury himself notes, Albania has been an iron-clad, not to say ferocious, Stalinist dictatorship ever since the closing days of World War Two. Visitors have been resented, even deported. The politest sort of Western interest in the tiny nation has been reviled and rejected by the local commissars and bureaucrats as prima facie evidence of a sinister "bourgeois" plot. So who is to blame for Albania's troubles? Why, says Mr. Salisbury, it is the West: not only have we kept Albania in "isolation," we have also been guilty of "writing it off." For confusing effects and causes this clearly takes the cake. An upside-down cake, of course.

● Radio Liberation, the station in Munich that is operated by the American Committee for Liberation, is currently transmitting, at dictation speed, a Russian translation of Djilas' *The New Class,* the book in which Tito's former Vice President, now in an unheated Yugoslav prison, proves by his own lifelong experience that the "classless society of Communism" is in reality a corrupt and parasitic tyranny. With slow, repetitive transmission on several wavelengths, spread over a two-month period, Russian listeners will be able to make hand-written or typed copies for study and local circulation. Extensive excerpts are also being broadcast in seventeen other Soviet languages.

● One of the braver actions of the Eisenhower Administration during the summer was to turn down Connecticut Governor Ribicoff's demand for federal drought aid. Spurred on by his own farm lobby at Hartford, Ribicoff had represented to Washington that the long dry spell of June and July had put his state in "crisis." Now comes a drought report prepared by the University of Connecticut's College of Agriculture. What the report shows is that the state's 3,000 dairy farms suffered a loss of $8,000,000, which, though it averages out at a little more than $2,600 per farm, is a loss that can be absorbed by most of the dairymen without running the risk of bankruptcy. As for the remainder of the crop damage, the only appreciable losses were $500,000 on the potato crop and $500,000 on the tobacco crop. Such losses might happen in any business, anywhere, in a bad year; moreover, some of them have assuredly been cancelled out by rains in late August and September. The "crisis," then, never was of disaster proportions—and Washington, by standing firm, has forestalled the creation of a vicious precedent.

● It is expected that the seventy-four-year-old Louis St. Laurent will soon withdraw from the leadership of Canada's Liberal Party, which is still licking the deep wounds it suffered in last June's crushing electoral defeat. As Mr. St. Laurent's successor, the betting now favors Lester Pearson, promoter of close relations with Communist China, and patron of Herbert Norman, late Canadian Minister to Egypt, who ended his life by a nine-story fall to the streets of Cairo.

● The continuing disintegration of the Communist Party, U.S.A., was marked last week by the resignation of the *Daily Worker's* foreign editor, Joseph Clark. Veering sharply away from Communist practice, *Daily Worker* editor John Gates—himself reportedly sharing Clark's rightist deviation—published Clark's 2,500-word letter of resignation. Clark's departure, like that of Howard Fast a few months ago, is symptomatic of a process started shortly after the Hungarian Revolt in most of the Western Communist parties. Tens of thousands of members, disillusioned by the anti-Stalin revelation and the Hungarian intervention, have been falling away, and leaving the party cells in the hands of the most hardened and cynical Moscow-men.

● Amid all their troubles over declining exports and the consequent loss of foreign currency the French have been counting on the tourist trade to fill their coffers with needed dollar exchange. To insure a steady flow of dollar-flush visitors, the French government exempted tourists last June from onerous payments for gasoline, purchase of which was to be arranged through the banks. Something went snafu with the exemption, however. First, it took three weeks to publish the special gasoline instructions for tourists; secondly, the Communist-controlled union of bank employees went on strike, making it impossible for foreign visitors to cash checks to pay for the gas. Bedevilled by the prospect of automobiling difficulties, and confused by rumors of strikes by airline and railroad unions, hundreds of visitors cancelled their summer plans for a visit to France,

which thereby missed taking in some millions in foreign exchange. The snafu bears all the stigmata of a Communist maneuver engineered from inside. Having lost the political battle in France, the Communists are doing their best to triumph by disrupting the French economy.

● *Forward, Day by Day, with John Dollard, Professor of Psychology, Yale University*: " . . . infanticide should be dealt with as a psychiatric and social problem and not as a problem for the criminal law; means of birth control should be freely available; both the eugenic and sociological arguments for sterilization are excellent; the legal hazards surrounding artificial insemination should be removed; since abortion seems inevitable, it should be legalized for safety's sake. . . . the legal taint should be removed from suicide; . . . the strictures against euthanasia should be removed for a patient desiring it, and the physician who cooperates in unselfish exercise of his professional judgment should be absolved from blame." (*New York Times,* Book Review Section, July 14).

● Thumbing through the program of the 53rd annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, we were arrested by the title of one of the panels, "Conflict and Crisis in Contemporary Ideologies." The first session of the panel, we noticed, was on Communism, the second on "The Crisis of World Socialism," the third on "The Crisis of Liberalism." But search though we did, we could find no fourth—no crisis of conservatism. We could only conclude that astute political scientists had come to the conclusion either a) that conservatism does not exist, or b) that it is altogether healthy and has no crisis.

The Court Views Its Handiwork

Let us suppose—as we can have no reason for denying—that Earl Warren and the majority of his colleagues are men of good will, loyal Americans according to their lights, sincere humanitarians who wish to improve the condition of their country and the lot of their fellow men. So motivated—very much like Roger Taney and his colleagues a century ago, as they debated the Dred Scott case—Chief Justice Warren and his court decided to skip a corner. They knew—so they thought, anyway— the true and only solution to the harrowing problem of race relations. Why wait, then, for the painfully slow evolution of community opinion and of legislative routine, both depending, as they do, on millions of persons? At a single bold stroke, nine enlightened men could cut the knot.

So, disguised by their judicial robes, they sat as a Supreme Legislature, and in 1954 passed a law called *Brown* v. *Board of Education.*

But—quite apart from the substantial content of their theory of race relations—by that very act they subverted the constitutional processes of the American system of government, and with inevitable consequences that can now be undone only by undoing the original decision. They overturned the delicate balance between the judicial and legislative functions, between the federal government and the state governments, between authority and community, upon whose interplay the life of our society depends. Under the disintegrating effect of *Brown* v. *Board of Education,* the units of our society are forced into extreme positions, into absolute dilemmas for which there is literally no solution within the traditional American structure.

What are we to say when Governor Faubus and his National Guard confront a federal judge acting in evident compliance with the highest court of our federal system? Unless we are prepared to abandon the whole scheme of a limited, mixed, and divided sovereignty, we must defend Governor Faubus, and his right and duty to preserve and defend the domestic peace of his state according to his oath of office. But we cannot advocate the defiance of due and lawful process, however distasteful it may be, without risking the breakdown of law in general, and of constitutional government. Thus the conscientious citizen feels that the commands of Governor Faubus and Judge Davies, though directly contradictory to each other, are both of them binding. Therefore the situation in Little Rock has no just solution, and can be settled only by violence and the threat of force.

This and a hundred comparable though less striking dilemmas throughout the South would not exist were it not for *Brown* v. *Board of Education.* No statute, no constitutional provision either federal or state, caused Judge Davies to issue his orders. It was only the usurping and fateful judicial opinion of his superiors, abetted by Attorney General Brownell's cold tactics, that forced him into direct conflict with the authorities who are constitutionally charged with the powers of making and executing laws.

As it happens, Governor Faubus and his state of Arkansas are not opposed, in principle, to school integration. Their colleges and several of their school districts are already integrated. But the Governor and his advisers believed that Little Rock was not yet ready.

And this is part of a more general, and most tragic, irony. For the decade prior to 1954 and *Brown* v. *Board of Education,* race relations in the South had been better than ever before in our history—or in the history of any racially divided society. The condition of the Negroes was steadily and peacefully

improving. Lynching and racial violence had virtually disappeared. Under the "separate but equal" clauses, excellent schools were being built for Negroes. Indeed, through the influence of industrialization and changing ideas, integration itself was in fact progressing in the field of education as elsewhere. Elementary school integration was working in from the border states, and was to be found at the college level even in much of the Deep South.

But *Brown* v. *Board of Education* has brought in its wake not only an eroding subversion of our constitutional system, but the very opposite of the results that Earl Warren's court presumably intended in the substance of race relations. The rate of school integration has slowed, not speeded, since 1954. The improved relations between the races have been gravely embittered. Violence and the threat of violence; base emotions; the cynical exploitation of members of both races by ruthless ideologues; the shameful spectacle of heavily armed troops patrolling the lawns and schoolyards of once tranquil towns and villages; the turbid dregs of hatred, envy, resentment, and sorrow—all these are part of the swelling harvest of *Brown* v. *Board of Education*.

What, we wonder, do Earl Warren and his fellows now think of the fruits of their handiwork?



Open Letter to John Kasper

Dear Mr. Kasper:

NATIONAL REVIEW has at no time during the integration crisis been among your admirers or well-wishers. We should prefer that you, equally with the NAACP, should go wherever it is you belong—New Jersey, isn't it?—and leave the white Southerners to carry on by themselves, as they appear to have done, and not too badly, before you went to their assistance. We are not sorry to learn of your arrest in Nashville, and do *not* propose to raise funds for your legal defense. We rather think jail is a good place for you.

However, we have some good news for you. There is a clear freedom-of-speech issue at stake in your case, and we know an organization—The American Civil Liberties Union—which is prepared to defend anyone who gets into trouble by exercising his constitutional right to think and say what he pleases. It is especially active in defending Communists who get into trouble that way, and we know it well enough to be able to assure you that it will not regard you as in any way exceptional because it happens to disagree with what you think and say. (It hates the Communists as much as anybody.)

So sit tight, old boy. The ACLU will not let you down.

THE EDITORS

"Managed Agreements"

The *Arkansas State Press*, a Negro weekly, artlessly observes that the recent behavior of Governor Faubus should make the Negro "more careful in selling his vote in the future." Since the buying and selling of votes knows no regional or racial limitation (it is an old story in Chicago, for instance), it is not particularly shocking to be told that corruption can play as great a part as outright intimidation in tainting election results in the South. One merely wonders at the fatuity of certain Liberals who think the franchise is going to be protected in Memphis, Birmingham, Little Rock—or Jersey City—by the passage of the Civil Rights bill.

A Southern correspondent writes us that Wade Hampton of South Carolina, away back in Reconstruction days, had a scheme to let the Negroes vote —he thought he could "manage" their agreement to his own candidates. Whether this was a delusion or not, it is certainly true that Mr. Crump of Memphis "managed" all the voters he needed, whether white or black. In some plantation areas the Negroes simply vote the way the landowners tell them: for example, in Bamberg, South Carolina, last autumn, a heavy percentage of them voted for Byrd on the States Rights ticket!

The whole business of getting an unalloyed expres-

sion of actual preference at the polls is extremely complex—which is the main reason why the business of protecting the ballot might better have been left to the evolutionary spread of enlightenment and good will. In the atmosphere now created by the specter of federal interference in local elections, angry men on both sides of an argument will certainly turn from intimidation to the power of the dollar to coerce the result. And corruption, since it operates under the table, is not something that can be enjoined by the federal judiciary.

The Time to Strike

Everywhere along its perimeter the Red Empire is hip-deep in trouble.

In Red China, as the NEA's Fred Sparks notes from Hong Kong, there is drought and starvation. Refugees report that "food is scarcer than since the Japanese occupation." Peasants are quoted as saying "you can kill your landlord but you cannot eat him."

In the Red Chinese cities, where oversanguine students and even government officials have been taking Mao Tse-tung's "Let a hundred flowers bloom, let diverse schools of thought contend" at face value, there is a sudden crackdown on "Rightists" for having dared to "bloom" and "contend." The Ministers of Communication, Food and Forestry have been denounced for refusing to recognize the leadership of the Communist Party. And on college campuses there have been ugly beatings of "blooming" and "contending" youth.

At the other end of the Communist world, in Poland, a "planned economy" wallows in extreme distress. The effort now is to get away from central planning. But as William Henry Chamberlin reports from Warsaw, housing, shoes, textiles, food, household appliances, buses and trolley cars are all in short supply, and the unmitigated ugliness of contemporary Polish life continues despite the small measure of freedom from Moscow that has been achieved by "national" Communism.

Just across the Carpathians from Poland, Hungarians still live in a state of terror. A survey titled "Hungary Under Soviet Rule," issued last week by an American editorial committee for the Assembly of Captive European Nations, says that Hungary is now policed by 100,000 Soviet troops.

With Red China, Poland and Hungary all in a state of pronounced disequilibrium, the *cordon sanitaire* with which the Soviets have surrounded themselves seems pretty sick.

Anyone who has ever quarterbacked a high school football team or played a middling game of chess would know that now is the time to increase the pressure, whether diplomatic, economic or propagandistic, on the Red Empire. But all we hear all around us these days are tired bleats that it is too bad the London disarmament talks have failed.

Pandit Nehru Wants Money

Do you suppose that anyone in the State Department, reading recent reports from India, thought of advising Mr. Dulles to write a letter somewhat as follows?

Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru
New Delhi
Your Excellency:

My government has received your extensive memoranda on India's mounting economic crisis. We note that within the past two years your reserves of foreign exchange and credits have fallen by 500 million dollars, in spite of a $200 million advance by the International Monetary Fund, and are now below the $840 million minimum limit set under your central banking law. We take cognizance of your statement that the goals of your second Five Year Plan are jeopardized, and your fear that serious social troubles may arise if there is no improvement in the economic condition of your people.

Your Finance Minister, T. T. Krishnamachari, we learn, is to be in the United States this month to attend a board meeting of the Monetary Fund. From him we are to receive further details concerning your urgent request that my government advance the Indian government a loan, over and above the aid and technical assistance now being supplied, of $600 million spread over three years.

The President wishes me to assure you, Mr. Prime Minister, of his active sympathy with India's economic predicament. At the same time I must inform you that the measures of relief you propose—and in particular the large new governmental loan—cannot be undertaken by my government, and would be of no lasting benefit to the Indian government or people, if granted. Under your centralized Five Year Plans, such a loan from my government to yours, far from helping to solve India's economic problem, would aggravate India's basic economic difficulties, and lead to a still more acute crisis a year or two hence.

We call to your attention, however, the fact that your current crisis is artificial and self-imposed. You have driven yourselves into your fiscal impasse; you are perfectly at liberty to reverse and drive freely out whenever you so choose.

In order to expand your economy at a faster rate than domestic savings permit, you desire and need considerable amounts of foreign exchange and credits. Such foreign exchange and credits—and in total sums far larger than those you now mention—are ready,

and eagerly waiting for the word that you have so far failed to give. They are in the hands of the bankers, investors and businessmen of my country and Western Europe, who are daily seeking where and how to give their funds effective employment.

You have no need to humiliate your young nation's pride by begging at the gates of my government's Treasury or by waiting month after month for the long grind of bureaucratic and congressional routine. You need only make clear to our bankers and businessmen that India welcomes their entry; that India's laws will permit them to operate with reasonable freedom and to make a reasonable profit from labors well done in the Indian market; that they are guaranteed against undue discrimination or arbitrary seizure; that your government, in forming its world policy, will not place Western interests at the mercy of our Soviet enemy.

Begin to act in this sense—abandon your stultifying Plan, your suffocating restrictions, your vain dreams of a democratic socialism that can only end in a totalitarian Communism—and dollars, pounds, francs and marks will flock to your shores without waiting for the word of parliaments and Presidents.

Shotguns Unregistered

The right of the people to keep and bear arms is guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. To many, this right must seem vestigial, even ridiculous. Nobody, it is argued, is going to challenge the federal possessors of tanks and atomic weapons by taking his .22 rifle down off the mantelpiece, so what, in terms of modern freedom, can the right to bear arms mean? Simply because the right has an archaic flavor, recent attempts to trench upon it have not encountered much opposition.

In New York State, for instance, there is the Sullivan law, which makes carrying a concealed weapon without a permit a state offense. Nobody objects to that, for who would carry a concealed "rod" except a murderer or a gangster? And who could possibly object to a new federal proposal to compel all arms dealers to require personal written acknowledgments of over-the-counter purchases of weapons? Compulsory registration of guns would keep no man from owning a hunting rifle, or from indulging in skeet shooting or backyard target practice.

Thus the argument runs, and who shall say that it is not a beguiling one? It is barely possible, however, that our forefathers knew more than we know when they insisted on the private right to bear arms. They had won their own war for freedom with squirrel rifles, but there was more to the subject than that. There was the safety of minorities against majorities, for example: in European history sects had been suppressed and even massacred after their guns had been seized. And even in this day of tanks and hydrogen bombs a wide diffusion of private weapons among a populace can act as a deterrent to tyranny. If Russian tanks had not rumbled over the borders of Hungary, the Hungarian fight for freedom might have been won with small arms in private possession. It is correctly argued that no dictatorship has ever been imposed on a nation of free men who were not first required to register their privately owned weapons. Such weapons were registered in Norway under a national law antedating 1940. When the Nazis invaded the country, all they had to do to halt rebellion was to possess themselves of official lists and to confiscate all registered private weapons.

It "can't happen here," of course. But why couldn't it happen in the chaos following a war of intercontinental missiles with hydrogen warheads? If or when that dread event occurs, maybe the freedom of the Americas from a tyranny of local Communist agents and stooges would depend on shotguns, unregistered.

NATIONAL REVIEW proudly announces the addition of two names to its masthead list of Contributors: that of Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, whom our readers will remember for his impassioned challenge to the conscience of the West during the Hungarian revolt (December 1, 1956) and for his brilliant essay, "The Bankruptcy of American Optimism" (May 11, 1957); and that of Garry Wills, who appeared like a meteor on NATIONAL REVIEW'S horizon only a few weeks ago when his article "*Time*style" (August 3), came in over the transom, and has been burning brightly in its firmament ever since. Mr. Wilhelmsen is a Santa Clara College philosophy professor, the author of an admirable biography of Belloc, and, at present, the holder of a Guggenheim Fellowship that has taken him to Europe in the current academic year. Garry Wills is a graduate student in Classics at Xavier University. Mr. Wilhelmsen, for all that he sounds like an elder statesman, is pushing 33; Garry Wills we may now take out from under wraps as the Younger Pitt of right-wing journalism: he is barely old enough to vote.

Our Contributors: ALLAN HOUSE RYSKIND ("Why Johnny Shouldn't Read") will be remembered for his verse, "Professor X: Composite Portrait" (September 8, 1956). After graduating from college in June 1956 he joined the Army and is now in the Information Service at Fort Slocum. . . . JAMES JACKSON KILPATRICK ("The South's 'Granitic Opposition' ") succeeded the late Douglas Southall Freeman as editor of the *Richmond News Leader*. He is the author of a recent book, *The Sovereign States*.

Governor Faubus Clouds the Issue

L. BRENT BOZELL

As many responsible Southerners see it, the blowup in Little Rock is the wrong war, fought by the wrong man, over the wrong issue.

Take the man. Governor Faubus is regarded throughout the South as a Liberal—he so regards himself. His "progressivism" is, to be sure, not doctrinaire. It is born of opportunism, as are his occasional rebellions against Liberal dogma. Faubus' principal debts are to the Sid McMath machine, which was thought in its day to be as far to the left as political machines get in the South. More recently—in his latest election campaign—he incurred obligations to pro-segregationist planters. Faubus tried to accommodate both creditor groups prior to the crisis in Little Rock by favoring segregated schools in principle while declining to contest the right of the federal government to impose integrated schools. It was a precarious position, and one that hardly recommended the Governor as a reliable advocate of the South in the momentous constitutional debate evolving out of the Brown case.

Or take the issue. His only quarrel with the federal court integration order, Governor Faubus maintains, is that it endangered the peace. He testified before the State Chancery Court on August 29 that admission of Negroes to white high schools in Little Rock, under the local School Board plan approved by the Federal District Court, would cause mob violence and bloodshed. On the strength of that argument, the state court granted an injunction. The next day the case was appealed to the federal court. Judge Davies reversed, and told the School Board to go ahead with its integration program. The Governor thereupon sent the National Guard rolling into Little Rock—not to enforce segregation or integration, he insisted, but to "maintain order."

As the week wore on, it became clear that "maintaining order" required turning Negroes away from the high school. Notwithstanding, Faubus steadfastly denied that either he or Arkansas was challenging the Supreme Court's ruling in the Brown case—as witness his answer to the first question put to him over nationwide television on September 8:

> Q: Do you dispute the authority of a Federal court to order integration in Little Rock?
> GOV. FAUBUS: No, I do not.

One further aspect of Faubus' position is worth noting. He was aked repeatedly by the TV panel how he thought it would all end. Carefully avoiding the answer his premises appeared to require—that the problem would be solved when the danger of violence dissipated, and not before—Faubus kept asserting that "litigation" was the way out.

Four Errors

Now, from the point of view of those in the South and elsewhere who are anxious to preserve the states' constitutional powers against federal encroachment, at least four things were wrong with Faubus' stand.

1. Evidence of impending violence in Little Rock was missing. On-the-spot reporters claimed they could find nothing to justify the Governor's fears beyond his assertion of them. The reporters might have been mistaken—but Faubus had all week to prepare a press release with a bill of particulars, and a golden opportunity to lay his case before the nation on television. He settled for unverifiable generalities. The Governor of Arkansas is, of course, not obliged to make public disclosure of the evidence upon which he acts to preserve the peace; but when he declines to do so, he deliberately discourages what he needs most of in a fight with the federal government—popular sympathy. The Governor's case looked phony.

2. Assuming, however, Faubus did have reason to fear violence would break out if the integration plan were implemented, why did he give the National Guard the orders he pretty obviously gave it? If he was not contesting the integration order, and was concerned only with preserving the peace, why didn't he direct his troops to escort the nine Negroes into Central High instead of telling them to keep Negroes away? Faubus' decision in this regard was further cause for legitimate skepticism about his *bona fides*. For if there was little reason to fear violence would erupt at all, there was even less to suppose the white citizenry of Little Rock was prepared to do battle with the National Guard in the event Faubus ordered the latter to uphold Judge Davies.

3. By Sunday, Faubus had so staked out his lines as to insure a politically profitable delaying action—but so also as to insure his ultimate defeat. His willingness to submit to "litigation" would allow him to hold out long enough to get credit for a David and Goliath act, without, however, thwarting Goliath. The only litigation Faubus could have been talking about either would be instituted in a federal court—as was Mr. Brownell's injunction action—or would end up in one; and the Governor could hardly have been in doubt as to how his cause would fare.

In 1932, the Supreme Court settled two matters of federal law that bear decisively on the Arkansas situation. Governor Sterling of Texas claimed sole discretion, when the peace is in jeopardy, to use state troops to prevent enforcement of a federal injunction. The Supreme Court ruled a) that the reasonableness of the Governor's action was subject to federal review, b) that if troops had to be used, the Governor was obliged to enforce compliance with the court decree rather than protect non-compliance. Q.E.D.

Faubus' only chance of victory, in other words, was to resist the federal government, *all* of it—the federal courts included—in the name of the state's reserve powers under the federal Constitution. He lacked either inclination or stomach for that course, perhaps both.

For—and this is the heart of the matter—Faubus' stand obscured the issue the South is primarily concerned with; its fatuousness, moreover, may have seriously damaged

(*Continued on p. 255*)

The Octopus—1957

Faced with the prospect of federal curbs on its irresponsible power, Big Labor is closing ranks and preparing for a bitter finish fight

SAM M. JONES

"They aggregate to themselves great, enormous wealth by extortion . . . They pursue, unmolested, unrestrained by law, their ceaseless round of peculation under the law, till they are fast producing that condition in our people in which the great mass of them are the servitors of those who have this aggregated wealth at their command."

This indictment might have been uttered yesterday; and there would be no difficulty in identifying the target. The shoe fits Big Labor, but it was fashioned long ago for another ruthless foot. The date was 1890. The debate was on the Sherman anti-trust bill. The subject was the "trusts."

The passage of the Sherman Act without a single opposing vote in the House and only one in the Senate, was the result of a cumulative public demand which had been foreshadowed in the enactment of anti-trust laws by a number of state legislatures. Even so, the war against the giants of business and finance raged for fourteen years until, on March 4, 1904, the Supreme Court, acting on a suit initiated by President Theodore Roosevelt, reversed a previous decision and declared the Northern Securities Company illegal. Corporate enterprise has never since been a law unto itself, and between that day and this Big Business, industrial and financial, has submitted with decreasing resistance to increasing restraints. Despite the enormous power of the opposition to anti-trust legislation, the Titans of Big Business were poorly entrenched, ill-equipped, and badly divided as compared with today's Labor Bosses.

There is ill will a-plenty in Labor's camp, but intramural quarrels will be forgotten and bitter hatreds will be set aside when Congress begins the Herculean task of imposing restrictive legislation on labor unions. When AFL-CIO President George Meany said he would fight any such attempt "to the last ditch," he was speaking for all his friends and foes among Labor's elite, from the Big Bosses to the small-fry officials. The average dues-paying member has no more voice in this decision than the average working teamster has in the coming election of a Teamster president. As for the public, deeds speak louder than words and Big Labor in action has resurrected the "public-be-damned" spirit of the defunct trusts, ignoring history and the mechanics of the boomerang.

Evidence obtained and exposed to public view during the investigation of the Teamsters' Union brought indictments and in some cases convictions of union officials, their relatives and their underworld collaborators. The discredited but still arrogant Teamster President Dave Beck, who, had it not been for the Committee's exposé, would have been sure of re-election, is under two income-tax indictments. Other high officials and many lesser ones are already entangled with the law or waiting fearfully its hand on the shoulder. But these are relatively minor results of Committee activities. The investigation has floodlighted the dark side of Big Labor, revealing the ugly spectacle of bribery, theft, malfeasance, organized violence, collaboration with criminals and Communists, restraint of trade, manipulation of "paper" unions, *carte blanche* for officers to take unsecured, unrecorded "loans" from union treasuries.

The Counteroffensive

Since the adjournment of Congress and the temporary cessation of public hearings by the Labor Rackets Committee, the Big Guns of Big Labor have stepped up their counteroffensive. On Labor Day, many speakers, officials of Labor Unions and of the federal government, emphasized—accurately enough—that the Committee's exposures implicate only a very small number of union officials. They failed to mention the old adage that one rotten apple can spoil a barrel. President Meany, however, did declare bluntly that: "We can and we will expel from our ranks, organizations that are found by public investigatory bodies to be substantially influenced in the conduct of their affairs by corrupt elements or individuals."

Al J. Hayes, Chairman of the AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee, fired a salvo, blasting politicians and employers for "trying to brainwash the working people."

On September 5, the date set for the Teamsters' "trial" by the Ethical Practices Committee, Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, in a formal speech in New York, *urged* Labor to do its own house-cleaning before "the force of public opinion becomes irresistible" but *warned* Congress against attempting to apply anti-trust statutes to Labor and against outlawing the union shop.

Speeches by Cabinet Members are usually screened by the White House and carry its implied blessing when released. This has not always been true during the present Administration; nevertheless when a Department head has spoken out of turn, repercussions have followed fast. Several other Eisenhower Cabinet members have had their views "corrected" in one way or another by the authorities at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, but so far at least, Mr. Mitchell has not been chastened.

The Teamsters' Executive Board had flatly refused the "last chance" to make categorical denial of AFL-CIO charges of domination by corrupt influences. In closed sessions,

the charges were denied in general terms, but members of the board, with the exception of Hoffa, spurned the Committee's demand for a reply to specific accusations.

Dave Beck, as spokesman, read a statement to the effect that the board had decided the Teamsters' Union was too big to be dominated by any single group of individuals, whether corrupt or not! He dismissed some of the accusations as "hearsay," and said in effect that the Union would handle its own affairs in its own way, without assistance or interference, and that no action would be taken against any official or member who pleaded the Fifth Amendment before any public body including Committees of Congress.

Vice President Brewster, now under sentence of $1000 fine and a year in jail for contempt of Congress, concurred in this statement, as did Vice President E. O. Mohn who is under indictment for contempt with his trial scheduled for this fall.

The Committee's accusations against Hoffa, according to Beck, came too late to be considered by the Board, but will be taken up later this month. Hoffa nevertheless delivered an hour-long speech at his EPC "trial" relevant to evidence adduced by the Senate Committee.

The Ethical Practices Committee reports to the AFL-CIO Executive Council September 24-25 in New York. The Committee may recommend that the Teamsters be ousted, and the AFL-CIO convention in December may take that course. Being thrown out doesn't worry top Teamster officials. With a million and a half members and $37 million available for new organizing drives, the Union will continue to be a powerful force whether it remains in the AFL-CIO or becomes an independent entity.

Labor's Primary Target

Big Labor's offensive-defensive strategy includes: a) cleaning its own house; b) shifting the onus from its own shoulders to those of a few black sheep and to politicians and employers; c) employing all news and propaganda media to convince union members and the public that unions should not be restrained by laws similar to those governing corporations; and d) punitive political action against members of Congress who believe such laws to be vitally needed.

Senator Barry Goldwater is high on the list, if not actually first among those whom Big Labor has determined to liquidate politically. Although still in his first term, the Senator commands national respect, is a forthright advocate of legislation to restrain and regulate organized Labor, and has sharply criticized Labor's Mr. Big—Walter Reuther himself.

Senators Goldwater, Ives, Kennedy and Curtis are the only members of the investigating committee who will come up for re-election next year. The heaviest Labor guns will be trained on Goldwater. Arizona is normally a Democratic state. The presumptive Democratic candidate, Governor Ernest McFarland, was majority leader of the Senate until Goldwater defeated him in a stunning upset in 1952. McFarland has a large machine following and is a veteran of many state and national campaigns, whereas Goldwater went to the Senate with no previous political experience. On the other hand, Labor within the state is not a formidable force and the state constitution contains a right-to-work provision which the combined efforts of Labor and Governor McFarland have failed to annul.

In an interview I have just had with Senator Goldwater, he stated emphatically that union officials should be prohibited by law from using union dues and assessments for their personal benefit. Commenting on the free and easy access of some union bosses to the members' money, he said: "They pillage the till, with the full knowledge that if they get caught they can always call it a 'loan.' Naturally, there is never any interest on these 'loans' and the members are never aware of the transactions except when the evidence is brought out by the courts or by an investigating body. Worst of all, there is nothing in the union charters or bylaws to prevent such pilfering."

The Senator told me that he had questioned Hoffa after the latter's public testimony that he did not think unions should be subject to anti-trust laws. Later, he said, in private conversation Hoffa agreed that if unions acted in restraint of trade they were inviting anti-trust controls. That night, said the Senator, Hoffa returned to Detroit and the following day the newspaper strike in that city was called off.

In response to a question regarding criticism of the Committee's alleged softness towards some witnesses, Senator Goldwater replied, "It's rather odd to find some of the same columnists and radio-TV commentators and editorial writers who tore the hide off Joe McCarthy for offending the delicate sensibilities of Fifth Amendment Communists and known crooks, now deprecating this Committee's lack of harshness."

After eleven members of Walter Reuther's UAW-CIO had taken either the First or the Fifth Amendment when questioned by the Internal Security Committee, they were absolved by the Ethical Practices Committee, the Senator said. "In effect," he added, "the EPC said that it saw nothing wrong if these individuals choose to consort with racketeers and Communists."

It will be many months before the Committee concludes its investigation and begins the task of formulating legislative recommendations. But the evidence already published makes it a certainty that there will be a powerful drive in the next session of Congress to pass laws to protect welfare funds, to prevent violence, to prohibit restraint of trade (including abolition of the secondary boycott), to impose a compulsory accounting of union funds and to liberate union members from the arbitrary domination of a few men through the creation of a democratic process of election to replace the present boss-ridden system which renders the rank and file as helpless as the chattels of a totalitarian state.

The Final View of Henry Two

"I'm really sorry to seem abrupt—
But we'd Reuther be safe than bankrupt."

JOHANNES EFF

Straws in the Enemy Wind

JAMES BURNHAM

Moscow. For several days following the first announcement of an allegedly successful ICBM test, the Soviet press carried no further statements from Soviet sources. Instead, they reprinted dozens of Western articles that not only accepted but grossly inflated the Soviet claim. This procedure confirms that: 1) the primary purpose of the ICBM announcement was domestic—to prop the prestige of the Khrushchev faction within the Soviet Union and (perhaps even more particularly) in the captive nations; 2) the Kremlin takes for granted that its subjects do not believe the home press, but will give some credence to what is printed in London, Paris and New York.

Sopot (Poland). A Jazz Festival, with no overt political motive, took place July 14-24. Jazz outfits present included the Joki Freund Quintet from Frankfurt; the Spree City Stompers from Berlin; the Dixieland '57 unit from Prague; the Riverside Syncopators from Genoa; and several Polish organizations, among them Cracow's Hot Club Mellowmen and Gdanik's Modern Jazz Sextet. There were individual American performers, but no American group. The Warsaw critic judged that "the acme of the Festival was the work of chocolate-covered Albert Nicholas, the prominent clarinetist from New Orleans."

Paris. In France and other countries where they have a mass following, the Communists plan a gigantic celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the Bolshevik "October," by which they hope to smother the memories of last year's Hungarian October. The French Party has already prepared six types of large colored posters to be displayed throughout France; seven series of booklets to be printed in editions of 7,000,000; many leaflets in printings of 2,000,000 each; a large exposition to be held in Paris; 20,000 local meetings, etc. No steps whatever have so far been taken to counter this grandiose political warfare campaign.

Warsaw. The English magazine, *Encounter,* prints two recent Polish comments on things American. The Polish Journal, *Po Prostu,* noting that the U.S. exhibit at the Poznan fair was "the one most criticized by the press and most attended by the public," observed: "Propaganda is necessary where people have to be persuaded about something they do not believe in. But since people in Poland are firmly convinced that life in America is fabulous and that it is something like paradise, all attempts to persuade them that it is really so are a waste of money."

A Warsaw movie critic commented on the disappointment of Polish audiences with the drab setting of the U.S. prize-winning movie, *Marty.* "In [the Polish public's] eyes America is the ultimate embodiment of a transitional state between dream and anesthesia. In American films everything is brilliant and luxurious, the hero is the happy owner of a fortune plus a beautiful girl, and for two hours the audience can drive in a wonderful car with him, swim in a pool under palm trees, and casually sign checks for enormous sums of money. But what a disappointment Marty proved to be! The spectator is shown a film in which ordinary people, living in ugly and oppressive New York flats, dream about an insignificant amount of money which would make it possible for them to open a butcher shop in the Bronx . . . Poor Polish public!"

Kerala. The majority (and the best) of Kerala's schools have been privately run, many of them by Christians, who are a higher relative proportion of the population than in any other Indian state. The new Communist government of Kerala has just passed laws to control all textbooks and to prepare for a state takeover of the entire school system.

Sofia. The official literary journal, *Literaturen Front,* has been compelled to rebuke the young Bulgarian writers for taking the post-Stalin "campaign against dogmatism" too dogmatically. Especially horrifying was the heresy of one writer who "went so far as to maintain that literature must be kept apart from current politics." There are signs that even in Bulgaria the young artists and writers have formed non-political Bohemian clubs, meeting in surrealized cellars (in imitation of the existentialist *caves* in Paris), such as have had a considerable vogue in Poland, pre-revolt Hungary, and to a lesser extent in Czechoslovakia. A cabaret staged recently by the "Under the Rams" club in a Gothic Cracow cellar had acts ranging from solemn recitals of great poetry to the parody of a strip-tease accompanied by a reading of Spinoza's *Ethics.*

Lidice (Czechoslovakia). As part of the campaign to divert continuing popular resentment away from the Soviet intervention in the Hungarian revolt, the regime organized a large-scale memorial gathering on the fifteenth anniversary of the Lidice massacre by the Nazis.

New Delhi, Peiping. Universal Research and Consultants (a new Washington firm of "consulting geopoliticians") believes that Krishna Menon is beginning to overtake Nehru in the Indian power hierarchy; and Chou En-lai, Mao Tse-tung, in the Chinese.

Budapest. The latest of the Kadar regime's lurching attempts to ingratiate itself with the steadily hostile Hungarian public has been a spate of cheesecake photographs—traditionally taboo for Communist journalism—in the official press.

Tokyo. Retired Japanese General Wataru Watanabe, on his return from a tour of the Chinese mainland, declared that the battle potential of Communist China was "very doubtful." He stressed that the poor condition of the mainland roads prevented efficient operation of motorized and armored units.

Letter from London

Nationalized Industries, No Restraint on Wages, Urged at Trade Union Congress

ANTHONY LEJEUNE

The political conference season is now beginning. Like the swallow that heralds the summer or perhaps more like a stormy petrel, the Trade Union Congress last week descended on Blackpool. Its proceedings filled the front pages and the news bulletins, thoroughly depressing everyone except the trade union leaders themselves and those of their followers who have no thought beyond tomorrow's pay package.

Nothing which happened at Blackpool was in the least surprising, of course; but that was small comfort.

Even last year when Mr. Frank Cousins first launched his thunders against the Government there were a few still small voices calling for restraint. But this year Mr. Cousins was the unchallenged king of the Congress. He and his colleagues swept away every hint of compromise. A modifying clause suggesting mildly that "there are questions of wages policy that confront the movement as a whole" was withdrawn from the general resolution on wages before the Congress even met. Last year the moderates secured the rejection of a resolution calling for a forty-hour week without loss of pay: this year it was passed with no difficulty at all.

Apart from the visit of Mr. Walter Reuther, who was greeted with tumultuous applause, there were three significant highlights. The first was an attempt by Mr. Campbell of the National Union of Railwaymen to have the whole structure of the trade union movement reviewed with the object of streamlining it. One hundred and eighty-four unions are now affiliated with the Congress and Mr. Campbell thought the number should be reduced to about thirty. His motives were not above suspicion: there is nothing he would like better than to see the two smaller railway unions absorbed into the NUR. Jealous as ever of their autonomy, the unions turned Mr. Campbell's suggestion down flat and refused to recognize the need for any serious self-criticism. It would in fact be a very good thing if the structure of the trade union movement could be reformed: but such reformation should aim at breaking down the vast general unions into smaller, more personal units rather than trying to enlarge them still further. This might make the unions less politically powerful but it would restore them to their proper function of looking after the individual interests of their members. Whether you think this a good exchange depends on your point of view.

Mr. Cousins' point of view is grounded in politics and the second highlight was a political one. The Labor Party Executive's nice new plan for nationalization by stealth (that is, for taking over shares in private industry) was weighed in the balance and found wanting. The Congress reaffirmed its faith in good old-fashioned Marxist nationalization and demanded an immediate schedule of industries to be nationalized. The unions control the purse-strings of the Labor Party and their vote is decisive at Party conferences: which means trouble for Mr. Gaitskell, who sponsored the new policy, and for Mr. Bevan, who "accepted" it.

More Wages—or Strikes

But the climax of the Congress was Mr. Cousins' resolution rejecting any form of wage restraint: one after another the leaders of the major unions followed him onto the rostrum to support it. The resolution was wrapped round with a specious air of respectability. Although it threatened industrial action, which means strikes if the unions don't get their way, Mr. Cousins emphasized that he preferred other means of "settling disputes." The union leaders refused to admit any responsibility for inflation. They were simply protecting their members against the folly and ill will of the Conservative Government, which had "reduced the puchasing power of the workers." They could accept no restriction on wages as long as prices and profits remain uncontrolled.

This line of argument is either highly disingenuous or blind. Profits are a relatively small factor in determining prices. They have risen far less than wages; and whether they rise or not has no logical connection with whether wages should rise. Egalitarian politics apart, the unions' case must rest on the ratio between prices and wages, and the figures concerning this are perfectly plain. Under the Labor Government, between 1946 and 1951, the average industrial wage increased by 37.5 per cent while prices rose by 32 per cent. Under the Conservative Government, between 1951 and 1956, wages went up by 43.5 per cent and prices by only 21 per cent. Whoever suffered from inflation, it wasn't the average unionist.

But Mr. Cousins cares for none of these things. The floodgates are down and the unions mean to ride the waves in triumph, oblivious of the maelstrom ahead. For, if wage costs continue to rise, how can any Government protect a country which prices itself out of foreign markets while depending on them for over a third of its food and almost all its raw materials? The unions may in the event behave less irresponsibly than their leaders' junketings at Blackpool suggest, but the record of the past few months provides little ground for optimism. More working days have been lost because of strikes in the first seven months of this year than were lost in the whole of 1955 and 1956 put together. It will almost certainly have been the worst year since the General Strike of 1926.

The real sufferers from inflation are bitterly resentful of the union attitude but they look in vain for any sign of positive action from the Government. Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Thorneycroft seem to have accepted inflation as a permanent, inevitable evil, something like floods or a recurrent earthquake. Meanwhile the drastic leftward movement of the Trade Union Congress will almost certainly be reflected in the forthcoming Labor Party Conference: and that bodes no good for Britain or her allies.

Why Johnny Shouldn't Read:

A Defense of Progressive Education

A writer young enough to remember what he suffered from college textbooks suggests a way to render them harmless

ALLAN HOUSE RYSKIND

At long last I have finished *Why Johnny Can't Read,* Rudolph Flesch's celebrated attack upon progressive education. Total reading time: two years. (Unfortunately, I have been partially exposed to modern educational methods myself, and had a little difficulty with the book.)

Though one can hardly deny Flesch's major premise, I vigorously dissent from his conclusion: that progressive education should be eliminated so Johnny can learn to read again. On the contrary, Johnny's inability to read should prove immensely valuable to him throughout his life.

For approximately sixteen years Johnny must attend school. Secondary schools are required by law. And college is demanded by the social pressures of the American community, in which the corner grocer is expected to ask the corner cop, "Harvard, Sir, or Yale?" Johnny, then, to be socially acceptable, is faced with the obvious duty of going to college. He can, if he wishes, go through college never having learned to read (some colleges even make this a requirement). He may then get a sheepskin in wood-craft, metal-craft, or maybe witch-craft (taught by left-wing professors who create witches for conservatives to burn). Of course, if Johnny goes through college in this fashion, he will grow up to be an illiterate Grade A moron.

Though this is certainly undesirable, it is nevertheless better than allowing Johnny to go through college having learned to read. For he will then have to study texts written almost exclusively by left-wing, Socialist, and anti-anti-Communist professors. And if Johnny goes through college in this fashion, he will grow up to be a *literate,* Grade A moron. And they're the worst kind.

Why? Well, as a recent college graduate (semi-literate, Grade B moron), I can tell you that the literate moron must adjust to one of two possible fates. He can be brainwashed by his textbooks. Or he can disagree with them. But these poor individuals come to a horrible end. They are usually to be seen on campus practicing a form of the forbidden suttee in which they set a match to all their college books and then gleefully leap into the flames. (This, by the way, is very much frowned upon by the faculty, who abhor book-burning in *any* form).

Some Illuminating Texts

To show Mr. Flesch how positively gruesome literacy can be, and to enlighten Johnny's parents who will soon be sending him back to school, I cite some of the material I was assigned in my four years at college:

1. *How to Understand Propaganda,* by Alfred M. Lee. This book defended Owen Lattimore and praised anthropologist Gene Weltfish, who, when the spirit moves her, explains how America used Germ Warfare in Korea.

2. *International Politics,* by Frederick L. Schuman. This text has been used throughout the college world for more than five years. The fifth edition, which I have before me, clearly implies that Red China is belligerent toward the United States only because America has interfered with the Chinese Communists' legitimate aims. (The author is presumably well qualified to write about Communism, having joined over thirty Communist fronts.)

3. *Government by the People,* by Burns and Peltason, which has been used in over 240 colleges since 1956. The authors, after carefully consulting their ouija, come up with the discovery that socialism has, among other things, "dramatically" improved England's coal industry.

4. *Roots of Political Behavior,* edited by Messrs. Richard Carlton Snyder and H. Hubert Wilson, Associate Professors of Political Science at Princeton University. This text, introduced to the schools in 1950 and forced upon students in over forty colleges in the *current* year, contains perhaps the most monumental amount of misinformation ever collected in a single volume. It is actually a collection of articles written by many well-known Liberals and fellow travelers, among them Harold Laski, the late Marxist; Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish Socialist who considers the American Constitution "impractical and unsuited to modern conditions"; Bruce Bliven, former editor of the *New Republic;* and Henry Steele Commager, professor of left wing history at Columbia University.

Of Big and Little Men

There is also Professor Robert S. Lynd, a sociology expert from Columbia University. Mr. Lynd makes this significant statement on page 370:

> Big business has carefully disseminated to the little man at the grass roots enthusiasm and pride as an American in the superefficiency of the marvelous assembly lines and other paraphernalia of giant technology that produces his automobiles and other daily conveniences. The little man is puzzled, hypnotized into inaction: if he is not to oppose *bigness* itself, the bigness of Henry Ford, du Pont, and the other great corporations

that make these characteristically American things possible, what is he to oppose about big business? *The technique of dazzling, confusing, and dividing the opposition, used by Hitler, has been skillfully practiced by the propagandists for big business.* [My emphasis]

Professor Commager contributes an article—originally written for *Harper's*—which has been widely distributed throughout the colleges and passed on to the student as a piece of scholarly prose unsurpassed in its logic and brilliance. It is based on the assumption that Americans have become hysterical over Communism. And Commager comes to this hysterical conclusion mainly because a number of Congressmen, students, and teachers vigorously objected to a presumably mild and intelligent speech given by Russian-born Mrs. Shura Lewis on May 6, 1947, at Western High School in Washington, D.C. "The most careful examination of the speech—happily reprinted for us in the *Congressional Record*—does not disclose a single disparagement of anything American. . . . She said nothing any normal person could find objectionable," says the professor.

Mr. Commager quotes only a few of Mrs. Lewis' mild words, but he left me so curious that I decided to look up the speech in the *Record* (May 20, 1947). Rather than bore the reader, I shall, like Mr. Commager, repeat only a few of Mrs. Lewis' words: "I never appreciated the life in Russia until I live here [America]. Here you have to work hard in order to live, use all your courage not to die."

You see? Just as Commager says, ". . . nothing any normal person could find objectionable." Yet the protests against Mrs. Lewis' statements caused Commager to write over 10,000 words on the dangers of hysteria in America.

No Emphasis Theirs

I cannot leave this book without giving a few quotes from the editors themselves. (Oh, I could, but I'm a sadist.) Page 507: "From Socrates down through John Locke, to Henry Wallace men have been abused and pilloried because their ideas did not conform to an acceptable pattern." (Wallace is probably pretty sore at being compared with those other two bums.)

Page 646: "We persist in expressing a belief in the innate worth of the individual, while tolerating the Ku Klux Klan, quasi-fascist groups, and such Congressional Committees as the Dies-Thomas Un-American Committee."

Page 558: "Perhaps the most common criticism of the American credo is that it has placed far too much emphasis upon the individual and his rights, while displaying too little concern for society . . ."

Page 559: "The separation of powers in the American Constitution rendered it difficult to govern and practically impossible to develop a concept of political responsibility."

Page 555: "As Pendleton Herring has noted, 'Free enterprise has lost its meaning in many areas of our economy, but the *empty phrase* has been taken over at times as a symbol for the protection of monopolies.'" [My emphasis]

This last lovely thought, plus the articles selected on economics, could make people doubt the editors' noble pronouncement: "No attempt is made in the various chapters to emphasize a particular economic . . . theory."

NOTION THAT JINGOISM IN THE UNITED STATES IS PATRIOTISM IN GHANA
NOTION THAT CHARACTER IN INDIVIDUALS AND NATIONS IS IMPROVED BY HANDOUTS
NOTION THAT TWO HALF TRUTHS MAKE A WHOLE TRUTH
NOTION THAT BIG GOVERNMENT JUSTIFIES BIG TAXES WHICH JUSTIFY BIG GOVERNMENT
NOTION THAT SUPREME COURT LEGISLATION IS THE LAW OF THE LAND
NOTION THAT UTOPIA IS WITHIN THE REACH OF ALL IF IT WERE NOT FOR CERTAIN SELFISH GROUPS
NOTION THAT FOREIGN AID IS NOT FOREIGN AID
DICTIONARY OF CATCH-PHRASES OR HOW TO LIVE BY EAR
BRAINWASH HEIGHTS

Kreuttner

"Naturally, if you only think about how little sense it makes, and disregard how wonderful it all sounds, you'll get a distorted picture of the way we Liberals look at things!"

There is nothing, absolutely nothing in this propaganda tract which a conservative can nibble on (unless you are willing to count Dwight D. Eisenhower's eloquent statement on why a military man should not run for President). Now, naturally, no one expects textbook editors these days to quote right wingers at length or even accurately, and certainly conservative quotations shouldn't be displayed where students would most likely see them. But it might be nice if Snyder and Wilson in a future book should squeeze some conservative opinions into a footnote or two—just so the student might know what he should be against.

It may interest the reader to know that Richard Carlton Snyder, who co-edited this volume, has helped write other texts which are being used throughout the USA. One of these is *American Democracy in Theory and Practice*. The 1955 edition attacks the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act; the Bricker Amendment, the security program, the "notorious" House Un-American Activities Committee, etc., ad nauseam. This edition features, among other things, the *Washington Post* cartoonist, Herblock (who also contributed a cartoon or two for Burns and Peltason's *Government by the People*).

Mr. Snyder also co-authored *American Foreign Policy*, which upholds the Dean Acheson-ADA line. Its fairness can be gauged by the fact that it accuses—without one iota of evidence—a whole block of Congressmen of being almost entirely controlled by the Nationalist "China Lobby."

The Positive Approach

So you see why I urge Mr. Flesch to quit his campaign for literacy.

But I have made only a negative criticism of Flesch's crusade, and these times, as our Liberal friends tell us, call for a positive approach.

Though book-burning is tempting, I have often thought it would be more positive to set fire to the authors and publishers instead. However, after I had singed a few one day in the back yard—just for practice—Los Angeles came down with a terrible case of smog. And the Japanese again condemned the United States for setting off a "dirty" H-Bomb. So, unfortunately, this is out of the question.

Perhaps, as I have already implied, what Johnny really needs is more, not less, progressive education. Then some day, I do not say immediately, the time will come when everyone will have a progressive education and no one will be able to read. And what a grand thing to know it will be possible for every school child in America to experience the delightful, delirious, glorious, and exhilarating experience of never, ever having to read a Liberal college text.

NATIONAL TRENDS

(*Continued from p. 248*)

the South's chances of winning on the main issue.

The South is, above all else, contesting the proposition that the Supreme Court is the final arbiter of what the Constitution means. The South believes that the Supreme Court can err, and that when the error results in infringement of the states' constitutional powers, the states are bound, not to ratify the error, but to try to correct it. Prudence requires that the mode of correction be, in the first instance, a protest—the South's dialecticians have called it "interposition." But interposition implies ultimate recourse to nullification: to concede that a protest must be dropped if it fails to persuade is to yield the right to interpose. The South, today, is reaching for the weapon of nullification; but Southerners want to wield it, if things come to that, responsibly—*i.e.*, on a sufficiently grave issue—and effectively—*i.e.*, under circumstances that will leave federal authorities with the alternative of giving way or resorting to politically unpalatable acts of brute force, and with no other alternative.

South's Position Weakened

Granting this as the objective, Governor Faubus failed the South. He yielded on the Brown case, and thus conceded the principle that the federal government has the ultimate right to adjudicate disputes *between* the federal government and state governments. He made the same concession even as regards his own contrived issue—a Governor's right to maintain order—by agreeing to litigation of the dispute. From the point of view of the South, there is no less involved in this concession than repudiation of the celebrated distribution-of-powers doctrine. Calhoun put the case many years ago. The only way a constitution can provide for the preservation of its original distribution of powers, he said, is:

> To give to each co-estate the right to judge of its powers, with a negative or veto on the acts of the others, in order to protect against encroachments the interests it particularly represents: a principle which all of our Constitutions recognize in the distribution of power among their respective departments, as essential to maintain the independence of each, but which, to all who will duly reflect on the subject, must appear far more essential, for the same object, in that great and fundamental distribution of powers between the General and State governments. So essential is the principle that to withhold the right from either, where the sovereign power is divided, is, in fact, *to annul the division itself*, and *to consolidate* in the one left in the exclusive possession of the right *all* powers of government; for it is not possible to distinguish, practically, between a government having all power, and one having the right to take what powers it pleases.

Calhoun was not saying—and neither is the South—that the states must *always* prevail. He was contending that the distribution of powers between federal and state governments presupposes and requires a continuing tension between them—and that if one side gives way all the time, the tension will disappear. The South believes it is the other side's turn to give way.

Faubus did more than stand on a comparatively frivolous issue while repudiating a substantial one. By his gestures of defiance and rebellion, and by effectively delaying integration, the Governor managed, withal, to identify the South's cause with his own. In the public mind, Little Rock was a testing ground for the principle of nullification—the prestige and power of the South were at stake. Faubus' "rebellion" was the South's rebellion, so that whatever defeat or humiliation he might suffer the South was bound to suffer too. Governor Faubus may have struck just the right balance for his private political purposes, but in the process he would seem to have weakened the South's position, and cheapened it.

Letter from the Continent

Parties' Internal Splits and Coalitions Help Swing Italy toward Welfare State

E. v. KUEHNELT-LEDDIHN

Ideological and philosophical forces still seem to be powerful factors in the Italian political scene. Only recently we witnessed without great surprise the *Osservatore Romano's* attack against the long deceased national hero, Garibaldi. Garibaldi deserves criticism from a purely Catholic point of view, but a historic, national figure of his stature is usually treated with silence by Vatican sources. (Could anybody imagine a semi-official condemnation in America of Jefferson, who in his writings was more savagely anti-Catholic than Garibaldi?) Yet it is a sign of the times that Vatican sources (which, of course, are not the Vatican itself), can afford to deal more scathingly with Italian idols than ever before. Indeed, Garibaldi has been turned into a protagonist of Italian leftism, a fact which should serve as a reminder to the American reader that nationalism and leftism in Europe usually go together; that the whole conflict between nationalism and internationalism is one between two kindred and competing forces. Nationalism, after all, desires centralization and deadly uniformity for a smaller, internationalism for a larger, area: the difference is one of degree and not of essence.

Of greater importance, however, than the figure of Garibaldi is the internal split in the *Democrazia Cristiana*. It must always be borne in mind that most (but by no means all) active Italian Catholics are supporters of the DC and that, inside and outside of the DC, Italian Catholics are split on many important issues. There are practicing Italian Catholics not only among the Fascists, the Royalists, and the Liberals (who form Italy's political "right"), but also among the Social Democrats, Socialists and Communists. (What about the Vatican Decrees refusing the Sacraments and Church burial to the Communists? the reader will ask. Here I can only reply with the Spanish: *"La ley del rey se obedece, pero non cumple."* The King's law is obeyed, but not carried out. Authoritarianism and strictness are not Catholic vices.)

Nevertheless the major Catholic political trends are represented *within* the *Democrazia Cristiana,* and it is precisely this variety of views within the Party which creates pressure for an "opening to the Left" and an "opening to the Right." Here again, though under a narrower denominator, we find monarchists and republicans, welfare-staters and economic liberals, papists and anti-papists, pro-Socialists, pro-Liberals, and even (from the point of view of readiness for a coalition) pro-Fascists. It is interesting to note that, besides the famous gynecologist Professor Gedda, the strongest spokesman for an "opening to the Right" is Don Luigi Sturzo, the octogenarian priest who was the founder of the *Partito Popolare,* forerunner of the DC. Don Luigi Sturzo is an intellectual, born in Sicily but living in Rome, whose articles in the (more or less National-Liberal) *Giornale d'Italia* still create sensations.

Yet, whereas the rank and file of the DC voters are undoubtedly on the Right, the leadership of the party today is "leftish." Italy's President Gronchi is an outspoken left-winger within the DC, and Amintore Fanfani, burning with ambition, is probably the coming man. (Many of those who know Fanfani well insist that his leftism is a strategic device rather than a deep conviction.) The present government (Zoli-Pella) consists of moderate right wingers, which shows that the intellectual party bosses prefer to remain in the background. (Here again we see the curious phenomenon of intellectuals turning left, which is *not* usual in Europe.)

Saragat, the leader of the moderate Socialists, after his failure to unite with the radical Socialists (under the leadership of the pro-Communist Pietro Nenni) has repeatedly voiced his willingness to enter a coalition government with the DC, while the Communists are spreading the news that the Vatican is putting pressure on the (anti-clerical, old liberal) Republicans to join the DC in a new cabinet which then would have a majority in the chamber.

This alternative between an "opening to the left" and an "opening to the right" cannot be delayed forever. A minority government which is merely tolerated by the chamber will easily collapse in an emergency. The Liberals—who get their support mostly from big finance, banking, the universities and the *haute bourgeoisie*—look with a certain confidence toward the future. They scored unexpectedly in the last elections, yet it is highly questionable whether they will be able to stem the tide leading Italy toward the welfare state. The new pension plan for the entire agrarian population, enacted by the DC, is part of this development which has specific ideological roots in the Catholic Left, but which, primarily, has been designed to wean the rural proletariat away from the Communists (who have reacted furiously indeed).

It is this particular danger which a leading Liberal, Professor Luigi Einaudi, former President of the Republic and a devout Catholic (also reportedly a convinced monarchist) had in mind when, in his message to the Tenth International Liberal Congress now assembled in Oxford he wrote:

> Indeed, the theme you will debate, the significance of social security in a free society, is of the greatest importance. We all agree on the necessity that the State receive the means to defend its citizens against the worst hazards and that the inequality of opportunity should be diminished. Still, without doubt, there also exists the danger that such a policy, instead of helping a free society, undermines it. An excess of "social security" can destroy the instinct to save, the feeling of family responsibility, and the affection for one's property, big or small. We all know the consequences of such a policy in exaggeration: inflation, ubiquity of controls, statism, decay of political liberty and the end of all personal and private intiative.

Fine words, especially for those who, in America, have the brazenness to call themselves Liberals.

John Reed "Rehabilitated"

The "best book on the Russian revolution" is to be republished in Russia with "corrective" notes—which will not mention the final disillusion of its author

MAX EASTMAN

The news that John Reed, literary genius and early American Communist, has been "rehabilitated" by the Khrushchev clique and that his famous book, *Ten Days That Shook the World* is being published in Russia, moves me to certain memories and reflections.

Whether the new edition will be the original book with its unqualified endorsement by Lenin, or a de-Trotskyized text such as was once printed in Moscow in English, we are not told. But we are told that it is to have a "'corrective' epilogue," and annotations "explaining to readers such 'defects and inaccuracies' as Reed's failure to depict properly Lenin's fight against Trotsky and his 'capitulators.'"

Any annotations under that head may be dismissed in advance as unqualified lies. Until Khrushchev gets ready to "rehabilitate" Trotsky—the word means nothing but tell the truth about him—none of these subsidiary revivals and republications will have basic significance. Their chief purpose—or one of them—is to keep up the bluff that "de-Stalinization" meant becoming civilized. They think Jack Reed is more of a figure than he is in America, and that publishing his book will help to hoodwink us into acting weakly and foolishly—or rather continuing to act weakly and foolishly—in relation to the Communist world conspiracy.

As a literary and historiographical event, however, the revival of that magnificent first-hand account of the October revolution is momentous. They can write Trotsky out of it, but they can't very well—unless their insolence actually passes the sound barrier—write Stalin in. The fact that Stalin's name is only once casually mentioned in Reed's account of the October revolution can hardly fail to impress Russian readers, and bring them a little way toward the truth. And its distribution by the hundreds of thousands in Russia—a safe prediction—will arouse interest in the book in countries where it is available unannotated by the Doctors of Falsification who hold the chairs of history in Soviet Russia.

This book is a classic, and a very American classic. No Russian—above all no Russian Marxist—could conceivably have written it. Jack London might have, or Mark Twain in his newspaper days. It has been described by Bertram D. Wolfe, author of *Three Who Made a Revolution,* as "the best book on the Russian revolution (with the possible exception of Trotsky's monumental three volume work) and the greatest piece of eyewitness historical reporting in English, perhaps in any literature." And that, I think, is not an exaggeration.

John Reed was by character a poet and a man of laughter and imagination. He liked art for art's sake, truth for truth's sake and he liked to raise hell for hell's sake. I described him, in criticizing a too solemn portrait, as one of those whose principal mission in life, and indispensable service to mankind, is to throw chalk at schoolteachers. But he was a great deal more than that. He was a thinking man, capable of intense application, and consecrated from his prep school days to the ideal of absolute candor, of speaking the truth as he saw it regardless of shame or danger. His relation to the struggle for socialism was not unlike that of Byron to the struggle for national liberty. He was a rebel wit and poet, but caught in by the fame and timeliness of his jests and writings to the life of action, and compelled to try to make good as an organizer. At some cost to his temperament and to the literature of his country, he did make good. From having been a flashing and imaginatively adventuring reporter-poet, he became an earnest propagandist and prose teacher—almost the embodiment of Lenin's austere term, "professional revolutionist." But this change, in my opinion, was neither complete nor permanent. It was but a phase in the development of a rich and varied nature. I once asked him how some part of his political work was going. "It's all right," he said. "It's going all right. . . . You know this class struggle plays hell with your poetry!"

Realization

My opinion is borne out by things his wife, Louise Bryant, and their friend, Angelica Balabanoff, told me about his last days in Moscow when he resigned in a huff from the Executive Committee of the Communist International. He withdrew his resignation, and death intervened—death and burial with high Party honors under the walls of the Kremlin—too soon for the significance of the act ever to be explained by him. Reports about it are confused, and opinions differ unendingly, and largely, alas, according to the political persuasion of those who hold them. Out of the welter there emerges,

(*Continued on p.* 262)

ARTS and MANNERS

GARRY WILLS

Religion and Bestiality at Stratford

Though all productions of Shakespeare only fumble at the mind and heart of that giant, any single one usually touches a nerve of the thousand here and makes it twinge. The Stratford Festival's *Othello* did this. One tableau suddenly revealed a hundred side-references; and though the tableau was the producer's idea, the references are authentic Shakespeare, however veiled in our secular age. These are the many and devastating references to religion—casual, and taken for granted, but not as unimportant.

The play was done in the fluid series of scenes, without elaborate sets or articulate "acts," whereby we try to capture the rapidity of Shakespeare's stage. This wash of people merely emphasized the monumentally simple square of white which stood central and unadorned in the last act, Desdemona's bed, with her wedding sheets on it. On this large white altar, with its simple curtain-backdrop rising high and white above it, the Moor lays his dead wife, white too, for chastity and death; then Othello stands there in his black vestments, a priest before his victim. The ritual posture, both of the victim and the priest, was unmistakable, and during this last scene Othello returns to his stance before the altar several times while all dialogue and action is stilled.

This explicitly liturgical staging of the love-and-death theme gives a theological weight to Othello's horrible lines about Desdemona. Speaking as a priest in the Stratford staging, he comments on Desdemona's protestation to Emilia that her husband has not killed her:

> She's like a liar gone to burning hell.
> 'Twas I that killed her.

So much was religion taken for granted that all things are immediately given an orthodox interpretation. Shakespeare drew from this live awareness of religious fact, as part of the human response he must calculate and use to present his drama. He shocks it, weights horror with it, deals in blasphemy as well as evil—a thing not possible to secular drama. As the Stratford tableau lit this one remark, to which we do not ordinarily allow sufficient literal meaning, so this remark cast light backwards on many others in the play. The vow of vengeance is religious, delivered at Stratford by a kneeling Othello and Iago. Iago deliberately invokes a real devil as his patron, calls him "Divinity of Hell," and uses the light trifle of matter called a handkerchief as a kind of devil's sacrament, "strong as holy writ" on the side of evil. After his spider's night of dark weaving—getting Cassio drunk, urging Roderigo to the fight, betraying Cassio to Othello—he says with beautiful nonchalance and choice of words, "By the Mass, 'tis morning"; and adds, to Roderigo and to himself (for his own amusement), "Pleasure and action make the hours seem short."

In one sense, the Stratford production was too ritually simple and religious. Iago became the devil in a morality play, a bloodless symbol, Mephistopheles out of romantic opera practicing what Swinburne called Iago's poetry of evil deeds. Shakespeare inserted the one twist, however, which destroys this picture of a Gothic devil chortling at his own cleverness, in Iago's neurotic belief that all men have been sleeping with his wife. This illumines his gratuitous insistence on sexual insult and imagery, so that even to Desdemona—especially to her, whose chastity insults him—he must talk in sly couplets and orate how women "rise to play, and go to bed to work."

Most directors see only the simple contrast between the towering mass of Othello's emotion and the subtle blade of Iago's wit. The noble brute pitted against ignoble brain: this is symmetrical, and can become facilely effective theater, but it misses the finer point, that Iago, though more subtly, is more thoroughly *animal* than Othello, the serpent instead of the lion. He knows no poetry of evil, an art for art's sake; he is himself tortured by it, writhing under his own torture of every decent trait in others, venting foulness as a protest to his own captivity, with a power of inspired obscenity.

His head teeming with thoughts "as prime as goats, as hot as monkeys, as salt as wolves," he is able to use words which themselves sweat, as Hamlet's do in the bedroom scene. Iago, for all his poise and intelligence, is ambitious, hurt by others' advancement, full of foul thoughts; he knows a jealousy far more absurd than his victim's. Even without a trifle as airy evidence, he is willing to believe that Othello "twixt my sheets has done my office," that Cassio has "leaped into my seat." Though outwardly polished, he is gross with a frenzy of tortured intelligence more base than Othello's tortured nobility. When he chants over the hero in his fit that neither poppy nor mandragora can med'cine him to peace, it is as one who knows, one men call today pathological, whom they used to call possessed; and the possessor cannot be the possessed. Mephistopheles, pure spirit blithe in evil, cannot be Iago, a *man* who only knows evil as alienating and a captivity. This diseased brilliance never came through the charmingly Mephistophelian antics of Alfred Drake.

The Moor from Venice, the City of the Lion—pitiful in that lion's nobility which is so quickly turned to a lion's rage, so that he roars himself to the verge of animal insanity; fuming, dropping into fits, becoming grosser and even (it seemed) blacker as the play went on—this Earle Hymen did well in the traditional manner. But Jacqueline Brookes was far too demonstrative and arch, without the shattering candor and simplicity of Desdemona.

The biggest disappointment of the evening remains in Alfred Drake, for here was the greatest talent and the pivotal role—Iago, whose grossness is foil to white Desdemona, as his brilliance is to black Othello.

BOOKS IN REVIEW

The South's "Granitic Opposition"

JAMES JACKSON KILPATRICK

The Supreme Court of the United States scarcely had delivered its opinion in the school segregation cases before Northern newspapermen set out for Dixie. They came like swallows, or like locusts, in great migratory waves: from Richmond to Farmville, from Farmville to Charleston, wherever the airlines flew, these agreeable carpetbaggers hopped from one superficial interview to another. In two weeks, or at most three, they did Atlanta, Birmingham, Montgomery and Jackson; then back to Chicago or Manhattan, experts, experts all. They have been a trial, Lord bless us, they have.

But some months ago, one journalist came, much better than the rest. He stayed a long time; he brought with him a keen ear and a perceptive eye. Plainly, his personal sympathies lay with integration, not with segregation; he opposes the Southern point of view. Yet to a remarkable degree, John Bartlow Martin managed to suspend his own feelings. He wrote for the *Saturday Evening Post* a series of five articles dealing chiefly with the Deep South's resistance to the Court's decree. These articles, somewhat expanded and now bound in book form, *The Deep South Says Never* (Ballantine, 35 cents paper, $2.50 cloth), offer perhaps the most objective look yet taken at the Southern school problem. Here is some first-rate reporting.

Mr. Martin would have been less than human, of course, if he had brought off a completely dispassionate job. Rather often his objectivity wears thin. Thus Mr. Martin, psychoanalyzing the South, must point up with sinister quotation marks a Southerner's reference to "my" Negroes, as if some subconscious sense of slavery slept under our id. It seems a harmless phrase ("my" employees, "my" tenants, "our" maid, "your" colleagues — what is wrong with it?) Again, he felt compelled to spell it "Nigra" when he was quoting white Southerners directly, though he put no other words in dialectal spelling. The noun sounds approximately that in Southern speech, but the Carolinian is innocent of any mean intent; he justs talks that way. Yet the effect of Mr. Martin's snide orthography is one of calculated ridicule, and the effect is heightened by the fact that his colored characters speak like Oxford dons. If he wanted to echo the white man's accent, he might better have attempted to reproduce the Negro's also. It was a petty little trick of writing, and Mr. Martin should have risen above it.

Those of us who live in the South, after three years of submitting to the visitor's probe, are perhaps overly sensitive to such flicks and stings. A more serious criticism of Mr. Martin's book would go to some things he left out. He never touches the grave constitutional questions that were raised by the Court's decree. He never considers the agonies of Reconstruction that directly affected the development of any school systems, white or Negro, in the South. He writes graphically of the bad part of Negro life in the South, but he reports little of the good—and there is much that is good. Curiously, he never touches upon the problems of integration in Washington, D.C., where integration has proved a catastrophic failure. He never examines the evidence on illegitimacy or crimes of violence among Southern Negroes; he is content to note, with his delicately contemptuous quotation marks, that figures put out by the Citizens Council "prove" these things to be so. Well, they are so, and more complete reporting would have covered the facts. Again, he dismisses as mere hallucinations the Southern suspicion of Communist involvement, yet a wealth of factual information is available that merited his passing appraisal.

Mr. Martin's best chapter covers the story in Summerton, S.C. His summation of the deep-rooted conflict there is done fairly and compassionately. He came to understand what no Northern tourist before him has seemed to grasp: "The rural South— this is the heart of the segregation problem." And he makes clear what too often has been obscured, that in many a Southern county obedience to the Court decree would not involve bringing a few Negro pupils into a white classroom, but on the contrary, the placing of three white pupils in a class of twenty-five Negroes. "I don't think your daughter would be comfortable in that situation," one Carolinian remarked to Martin. "I know mine wouldn't."

The chief value in Mr. Martin's work lies in the blunt honesty with which he reports the South's "granitic" opposition. This is the key fact in the South today, and he does not minimize the truth. Yet a perfect objectivity might at least have recognized the equally hard, unyielding nature of the forces opposed to the South. Mr. Martin comments wearily that "in discussing segregation Southerners are not only of one opinion, they reach their opinion through mental grooves as well worn as those of phonograph records." In my own observation, Northern liberals, who are equally of one opinion, are equally fixed in wax; their attacks upon segregation — legal, political, social, moral — are as unvarying as the Southerner's defense.

Over most of the South, and over all the Deep South, the public school problem is no closer to a solution today than it was three years ago. A solution, in fact, is more remote now than it was then. For ably reporting this melancholy situation, Mr. Martin—foe of the South though he may be—merits at least a measure of Southern thanks.

The Not-So-Different Kremlin

RODNEY GILBERT

Two books have recently appeared to which large bodies of readers will doubtless turn for answers to the question of what changes in the Red Empire since Stalin's death mean to us. Both are by men who have been writing on Soviet affairs, with various receptions in various camps. *Russia in Transition,* by Isaac Deutscher (Coward-McCann, $4.50) and *Russia Revisited,* by Louis Fischer (Doubleday, $4.00) were written, and were presumably too near publication for revision, when Nikita Khrushchev expelled Molotov, Malenkov and Kaganovich from the supreme Party Presidium. It is doubtful, however, whether this development, if it had come earlier, would have made any great difference in the major theses of the two authors.

They agree that while there have been some changes in the conditions under which the Russian people live —none greater than those resulting from the easing of the police terror— there has been no change in the system of government, no radical change in the system of control over agriculture and industry, and no great change projected in the economic policy. Both see greater and more spectacular changes coming than the Khrushchev coup, which neither foresaw. Neither ventures to say explicitly what these changes will mean to us. That is left to our inclinations.

As for the character of the changes: Mr. Fischer foresees the disintegration and eventual collapse of Communism as a cult and as a politico-economic system. But Mr. Deutscher foresees the eventual regeneration of pure, pristine, warm-hearted, starry-eyed "scientific socialism" in the Soviet Union, as the result of a movement among proletarians and intellectuals even now under way. "It is the twilight of totalitarianism that the USSR is living through," he says, meaning the twilight of Stalinism. But the changes will come within the existing socialistic framework. Industry, commerce and communications will continue to be the business of the state and there will be no redivision of the land among the peasants into privately owned and operated farms. I suppose it is implied that the Red Empire will then be run by such nice people that "peaceful coexistence" (a phrase never used) can then be taken for granted.

The first eighty pages of Mr. Deutscher's book are made up of material, including his appraisal of the situation and prognostications, which has some bearing on current events. All the rest of it, except for the chapter on "Marx and Russia" which is of historical interest, is simply padding, which the reader can skip with more profit than loss, up to Part Four, dedicated to "Heretics and Renegades." Some of this he must read because of the light it throws on Mr. Deutscher's special position. Its first chapter, entitled "The Ex-Communist's Conscience," appeared in the *Reporter* in April 1950 as a review of *The God that Failed*: we must be grateful to Mr. Deutscher for reproducing it and for exposing himself thereby as a savage anti-anti-Communist.

Mr. Deutscher alleges that all the ex-Communists begin as rebels against the Stalinist perversion. Then they slip back into being anti-Communists—a sad enough state. But then they become apologists for capitalism, agents of reaction, accessories to witch hunts. He quotes Koestler as saying that the ex-Reds look to liberals like defrocked priests taking a girl out to a dance. But Deutscher thinks that they look more like defrocked priests taking out harlots.

He names many names, other than the authors of the book he was reviewing. James Burnham is credited with the belief that Communism should be destroyed the world over. No comment. That charge is supposed to elicit a gasp of horror, without prompting from Deutscher. In this author's vocabulary a Communist who loses his religion is a heretic; but a Communist who then turns conservative is a renegade. This chapter of the book is meant to be contemptuous. Actually it is full of fear, anger and hate. Anyone who can get hold of this book without squandering the price of it should read this chapter first, then go back and read the opening sections with the clear understanding he will have of the purpose of the book: A plea for the "sympathetic understanding" (quoting Neville Chamberlain of 1927) of the de-Stalinized Communism of the near future.

I have left myself sadly inadequate space for a much better book. Mr. Louis Fischer is a former supporter of Communism who once spent some years in Moscow as a correspondent, who then improved a nineteen-year absence from Russia as an anti-Stalinist first and then as a wholehearted anti-Communist, who somehow got a visa for a return visit—extended to twenty days through Mikoyan's intervention. That doesn't seem like an adequate period for a revaluation of Soviet Russia. But, for a man who had been there for years before and who spoke the language so well that he had to explain sometimes that he was not a Russian, the time was sufficient for Mr. Fischer to collect the makings of a tremendously interesting account of life, thought and talk in the Soviet capital today.

Mr. Fischer's conclusions: There will be no war. There will be little if any pressure on Europe. The objectives of Red imperialism are in Asia. In Russia a mass rising against the government by a thoroughly cowed people, with a horror of chaos, is very unlikely; though a military coup is conceivable. There will be no more Stalinist savagery, and living conditions will improve somewhat, but "the scrapping of the Stalin system and the establishment of democracy on its ruins," though inevitable, is certainly not planned by the present dictatorship and will be a painfully slow process. Meanwhile the big objective in the Kremlin is power, power and more power.

Fiction Chronicle

Troubled by Innocence

ROBERT PHELPS

I have no statistics on the subject, and there is no room to venture a list here, but I suspect that a substantial number of the best novels we have had this century have explored the same basic relationship. Sexes, motives, backgrounds will vary. The treatment may be overt or elliptical. But in writers otherwise as unalike as E. M. Forster and Djuna Barnes, Ronald Firbank and Isaac Babel, D. H. Lawrence and Cocteau, we can find the same obsessive story: a person who is still oblivious (for which, read: heedless, impulsive, amoral, even innocent) is beheld by someone who has fallen into self-consciousness.

Shakespeare was probably the first poet to sketch this relationship when Hamlet watched Fortinbras with despair and self-recrimination. But the reactions can be more personal. Claggert hated Billy Budd; Léa doted on Chéri; Lady Chatterley preyed upon her gamekeeper. In each case, though, a born watcher has encountered someone who seems closer to the animal kingdom than the fallen state of human beings. And, in the former's envy, nostalgia, and compulsion to possess and somehow identify with what he can never be, lies the story. It is usually a tragedy, but in any case, the watcher cannot succeed, and will never be the same again.

No matter how often it has been taken up, this is evidently still a theme which is not exhausted. It is only September, and four of the best novels we are likely to get this season are haunted by its somber axis.

In two of these, both translated from the French, the cast is almost identical: a family of self-satisfied provincial gentry is shaken by the passage of a young man whose ease, assumption and reckless charm are all the more dangerous because he is not wholly responsible for them. He arouses passion in everyone, and in François Mauriac's *Lines of Life* (Farrar, $3.50), he himself is destroyed as a result. In Julien Green's *The Transgressor* (Pantheon, $3.50), he is a more deliberate cad, causing at least one suicide; but his very cruelty is less a conscious sin than simply the extension of his extraordinary effect on those around him.

The blurb of Jack Kerouac's new novel calls him the voice of the hipsters, the new "beat generation" of the fifties, inferring an analogy with Hemingway and the earlier "lost generation" of the twenties. But just as *The Sun Also Rises* is about more than the posturings of its particular epoch, so *On the Road* (Viking, $3.95) has a deeper subject than the current teenagers who—for lack of social, or religious, or even financial imperatives—discharge their energy point-blank in fast driving, faster fornication, and a galvanic boredom which always seems to be two steps ahead of them.

What is best about *On the Road* are the landscapes: America west of the Mississippi, Los Angeles and Mexico are seen as precisely and lyrically as Hemingway's Michigan and Spain. Next best is the narrator, a young writer in search of heroic action, and Dean Moriarty, a particularly wild and driven young maverick whose hectic hurtling from New York City to the Pacific and back at 115 MPH is real, personal, desperate, and more than generically delinquent. The heart of *On the Road* is why Sal Paradise, a literate young man who is only playing at hipsterdom, should leave his marriage and his book to follow Dean on his compulsive quest. Little of *On the Road* probes this center, which struck me, again, as another instance of a complex human being trying to identify himself with a simpler one, as Hamlet might have forgotten his father and rushed off after Fortinbras' army.

Lawrence Durrell's *Justine* (Dutton, $3.50) seems to me to be the most original and enduring novel to come out of England since Henry Green's burst of creation in the mid-forties. On the other hand, its virtues are conspicuously un-British. For one thing, it treats sex without concupiscence. For another, it uses a keen, unabashed first person, which the English novel usually eschews lest someone get his hands dirty in the telling. For another, it takes place in non-neo-Elizabethan Alexandria, without tea cups, rolled umbrellas, or vapid chitchat. Best of all, it is written in a prose which ought to remind us that English has a supple genius entirely its own, with no need to go on aping Latin.

The Justine of its title is a girl, but the book is not so much about her as about the effect she has on everyone else. The first time I read it, I explained Justine to myself as follows: she is really a sort of poet, only her medium of creation and self-realization is her body. What appears to be insatiable promiscuity is nothing of the kind. She sleeps with a man in the same spirit of pure-hearted commital with which a writer exposes his language and imagination to whatever subject matter attracts him.

On my second reading, I decided this was nonsense, and today Justine remains as deep and real a mystery to me as she does to her husband, or any of her lovers, all of whom are equally frustrated by their inability to possess more than her body. It is only by her effect on them, elusive and heartbreaking, that I identify her as the most closely studied image a novelist has yet given us of the relationship I have been discussing. Her innocence, her purity, are as explicit as Billy Budd's. Her passage through Lawrence Durrell's Alexandria is as inadvertently sad and destructive as Robin Vote's through *Nightwood*. No one who has ever known her will be quite the same; nor understand why; nor be able to forget. A mystery remains.

To order any book reviewed in this book section, write:

THE BOOKMAILER

Box 101, Murray Hill Station
New York 16, N.Y.

Return mail service—postpaid
PAY ONLY BOOKSTORE PRICE

$.....payment enclosed

Please send me: .....
(name of book)

.....

.....

Name .....

Address .....

.....

(No C.O.D. orders accepted; payment MUST accompany order. N.Y. City residents add 3% tax.)

To the Editor

"Why the South Must Prevail"

I read your most excellent editorial entitled "Why the South Must Prevail" [August 24] in the *Congressional Record*. That the claims of civilization supersede those of universal suffrage should be obvious to anyone more interested in good government than in abstractions. . . .

Your statement, "Universal suffrage is not the beginning of wisdom or the beginning of freedom," should lead one to conclude that in governments most overtly democratic, the real power often retreats to a back room. Therefore the distinction is not between "democracy" and "dictatorship," but between responsible and irresponsible oligarchy.

Jefferson was *responsible*, and he ruled, by a limited suffrage, for at least twenty-four years, either in his own person or in the person of his successors. . . .

Washington, D.C. JOHN CHATEL

Exploiting the Negro

One of your readers ["To the Editor," September 7] claims that the South has for three hundred years been exploiting the backwardness of the Negro. He claims that the present uproar is entirely about this alleged fact. . . .

This idea ignores the fact that all superior civilizations, and people for that matter, must of necessity "exploit" the lower ones, in the sense that the labor of the higher people or peoples must and always will be more remunerative than that of the lower ones. . . .

Brooklyn, N.Y. HORACE GREELEY, JR.

Mr. Bozell's Dissent

I would like to second Mr. Bozell's dissent [September 7] from your editorial "Why the South Must Prevail." But I do not agree with his argument. I do not think that integration is essentially a legal question. I do not think that the Republic conceived in the American Revolution and born in the Civil War between the States is facing a life or death issue here. But we may be involved in something that is even more important—the birth of a nation.

NATIONAL REVIEW's great point—that the Negro is a novice in the Judaic-Christian civilization in which his neighbors have grown old—is one that you deserve great credit for making, and making alone in the North. I often think that NATIONAL REVIEW is the only magazine in the country that realizes that every hour of twenty centuries of Christianity tells against Communism and everyone who has the faintest sympathy for it—and that nothing else stands against it.

But I think that the most sophisticated Christian in the world, or the most unsophisticated, watching on television armed and helmeted soldiers escorting colored children through walls of white children clutching stones or turning their backs, would be forced to consider whether this is 1957 A.D. or 1957 B.C.

Pelham, N.Y. ARTHUR EGAN

If Mr. Bozell had only infused himself with the historical facts surrounding the "adoption" of the so-called Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, his vociferous "dissent" would not have been read with a sense of frustration and despair by white Southerners who are, and have been, as much in favor of adherence to constitutional process as he is, and whose fervent hope is the conservative realignment necessary to bring it about.

Beaumont, Texas CHARLES R. WALKER

JOHN REED "REHABILITATED"

(*Continued from p. 257*)

however—for me at least—a firm conviction that Reed was on the road to a repudiation of the dictatorship over the world movement of a Russian nationalistic Party bureaucracy. As Theodore Draper says, after a thorough study of the existing reports: "If disillusionment is understood intellectually and emotionally rather than organizationally, Reed was probably as disillusioned as it was possible to be and still remain within the movement." Even Granville Hicks, who was still a Party Communist when he wrote Reed's life story, accepted the testimony that even before typhus took him Reed "looked older and sadder and very intense," his eyes "were startled and a little hurt," and "he talked of America and the novel and poetry he intended to write." It could hardly have taken Jack Reed as long as it took Milovan Djilas to realize that the Russian nationalistic Party bureaucracy with which he locked horns so early had transformed itself into a new ruling class.

How He Wrote It

In my book, *Heroes I Have Known*, I told about a meeting in the middle of Sheridan Square, where just two or three doors from my rooms, he wrote *Ten Days That Shook the World*—wrote it in another ten days and ten nights or little more. He was gaunt, unshaven, greasy-skinned, a stark sleepless half-crazy look on his slightly potatolike face—had just come down after a night's work for a cup of coffee.

"Max, don't tell anybody where I am. I'm writing the Russian revolution in a book. I've got all the placards and papers up there in a little room and a Russian dictionary, and I'm working all day and all night. I haven't shut my eyes for thirty-six hours. I'll finish the whole thing in two weeks. And I've got the name for it too—*Ten Days That Shook the World*. Good-by, I've got to get some coffee. Don't for God's sake tell anybody where I am."

Not so many feats can be found in American literature to surpass what he did there in those two or three weeks in that little room with those piled-up papers in a half-known tongue—piled clear to the ceiling—and a small dog-eared dictionary, and a memory, and a determination to get it right and a gorgeous imagination to paint it with when he got it. He had an unqualified, concentrated joy in his mad eyes that morning. He was not a Party organizer then, and he was never meant to be.

We had a lot of "exploring" to do . . . before we could bring you KENNAMETAL*

When you see Kennametal being used in woodworking, metal-cutting, coal and mineral mining, or as a vital machine part where abrasion is a problem—you probably never dream of all the *exploring* that had to be done before it reached its final form.

First . . . exploring desert and jungle for sources of better essential ores. Next . . . exploring improved methods of reducing and refining the ores, to usable ingredients. Next . . . exploring to discover ways that will better yield tungsten carbide metal with properties required for specific applications.

The result has been a dependable, hard alloy that outperforms and outlasts other metals in the metalworking, mining, woodworking and other industries.

Thus, with Kennametal, American industry gets a "plus" that comes from this exploration and from quality control from "mine to machine" . . . a plus that helps to speed up production and lower costs. KENNAMETAL INC., Latrobe, Pennsylvania.

The use of Kennametal means *more* production for *less* cost. This can mean *lower* prices and *greater* profits. But the increased profits thus made possible, and *all* savings, will *buy* less, if the government people continue to dilute our currency with Inflation Paper Money.

Only the re-establishment of the Gold Coin Standard will assure that our Dollars will have good future purchasing power.

Protect your family and your business by insisting that your public officials—Local, State and Federal—stop spending your tax money on extravagant, socialistic, vote-buying projects and thus stop the hidden tax that Inflation money means.

*Kennametal is the registered trademark of a series of hard carbide alloys of tungsten, tungsten-titanium and tantalum, for tooling in the metalworking, mining and woodworking industries and for wear parts in machines and process equipment. Kennametal is being used advantageously in practically every industry.

B-5010

One of a series of advertisements in the public interest

INDUSTRY AND
KENNAMETAL
. . . Partners in Progress